App. F. IX-4

Previous References

192 8.
(Mezrai)

File No. 143-28

Serial Nos. /

Later References

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos /

Part B for October 1928

SUBJECT

Entry of Mr B Rachappa, Dy. Bonilder of Kanasi Sub. Taluq to the outside Verandah of Sri Hanumanta Swami temple at Agasur

---

Filed

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore.....3rd..October.....*192* 8.

5th

No. 557 Sr-2
284

SECRETARIAT
6 OCT 1928
MUZRAI

FROM

P. G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

5411.

6 OCT. 1928
No. 2278

Mur 143-28-1

To

P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

I have the honor to forward herewith for favour of information a copy of Shimoga Deputy Commissioner's letter and my reply to him in the matter of the entry of Mr. B. Rachappa, Deputy Amildar of Kumsi -- Sub Taluk, to the outside Veranda of the temple of Sri Hanumantnadevaru at Ayanur in connection with the investigation into an offence of --- burglary committed on 16th August 1928 in the Archak's house within -- the temple premises.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.C.No.421/28-29 dated 20th September 1928 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Samprokshana - entry by an Adikarnataka - Sri Hanumantha Devaru temple at Ayanur.

In forwarding herewith a file of records ending with memo No.RI.N.C.89/28-29 dated 13th September 1928 re the above from the Sub Division Officer, Tirthahalli Sub Division, I have the honor to state that the temple of Sri Hanumantha devaru at Ayanur is a village Muzrai institution under the management of the -- villagers. On the night of the 16th ultimo a burglary took place in the temple where the Archak was living without permission and contrary to relegious scruples. Mr. B. Rachappa the Adikarnataka Deputy Amildar had to visit the scene of occurrence the next day in connection with the investigation of the case and while so -- doing he took his seat on an open pial of the temple building. No one appears to have taken objection to it then, but, later on the village Panchayet passed a resolution protesting against the action of Mr. Rachappa in having stepped on the pial and urging the performance of Samprokshana at his cost for the removal of the alleged pollution. Without stopping at that the villagers including two Shanbhogues of the place issued a registered notice on the 20th, calling upon Mr. Rachappa to pay down Rs.200/- for Samproksana expenses on pain of being proceeded against according to law with a view to recover the same. The Sub Division Officer Mr. C.Narohna, made detailed enquiries in the matter and in submitting a report, stated that in his view the entry of Mr. Rachappa on the outside -- varandah was a bona fide act not done with any intention of offending the religious scruples of the people, that the issue of the notice was an act of deliberate mischief on the part of the subordinate village officers, and that Samproksana if necessary might be done at the cost of the Archak whose residence in the temple was the cause of the trouble. Mr. C. Krishna Rao, who succeeded Mr. Narohna was also -- requested to make further enquiries regarding the conduct of the two Shanbhogues and the Archak and he reports that he has placed the -- said Shanbhogues under suspension for three months and has let off the Archak with a warning. (vide Memo No.87/28-29 dated 18-9-1928.)

2. Apart from this aspect of the case in which I entirely --

approve of the action taken by the Sub Division Officer, one important question on which I have not yet passed orders, viz., whether Samproksana is necessary as urged by the village Panchayet. Samproksana is to be performed if shastrically, there is any pollution to the deity. Whether in this instance, there has been such a pollution is a matter on which I feel a doubt. I may mention here that the temple is a single roofed building with a Garbhagudi inside and an open pial in front. The Archak had his residence within -- the walled enclosures, just outside the Garbhagudi and it is here that the burglary was committed. If Samproksana is necessary it is obvious that there are two view points from which the question can be considered -- First, there was pollution already, on account of the entry into the temple by the burglars. Secondly, on the next morning, there was the entry of Mr. Rachappa which was only on the pial outside of the closed enclosure in which the Archak was living. The point I should like to make clear before passing orders is --- whether the said ceremony is rendered necessary on account of the first happening or of the subsequent incident or, again for both the reasons. Were there two distinct pollutions each necessitating purification? Since the points are to be decided in the light of the Shastraic rules I request you to kindly instruct the Agamics of your office to furnish their opinion in the matter. If it is considered necessary that Samproksana should be performed for any given reason, I request that details as to cost thereof might also be required to be furnished.

2. I have given above all the informations available re the spot where the alleged pollution took place. There is also a sketch of the temple building enclosed in the records. If however the -- Agamics consider it necessary to have a view of the scene of the occurrence before giving their opinion I request that they may be ordered to visit the place "

"C o p y"

For Mysore Commissioner.

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore, 3rd October 1928.

From

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,

Shimoga District.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.C.421 of 28-9 dated 20th September 1928, in the matter of the entry of Mr.P. Rachappa, Deputy Amildar, into the open pial of the temple building of Sri Hanumantha devaru ~~temple~~ at Ayanur in Kumsi Sub Taluk I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the opinion furnished by the Agamiks of this office as desired by you. They are of opinion that Samprokshane ceremonies are absolutely necessary on account of the burglary committed within the temple premises on 16-8-28, and that in case the veranda of the temple is in direct contact with the main building some additional"Samprokshane" ceremonies are necessary on account of the entry of Mr. B. Rachappa into the veranda. Even in case there is no direct contact between the veranda and the temple proper they say that in this particular case the additional"Samprokshane" is necessary as the entry was made with boots. An estimate of the cost prepared by the Agamiks is enclosed. I request that necessary further action may be taken in accordance with the above opinion of the Agamiks.

The vernacular records received with your letter are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sd.) P. [illegible]

Muzrai Commissioner.

-2-

"C.C.D."

For Muzrai Commissioner.